

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.
---

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SIX

In re A.S., a Person Coming  
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

2d Juv. No. B290359  
(Super. Ct. No. PJ52429)  
(Los Angeles County)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

A.S.,

Defendant and Appellant.

Appellant A.S. was placed at home on probation after the juvenile court sustained a petition under Welfare and Institutions Code section 602, subdivision (a), alleging that appellant committed the felony offense of battery with serious bodily injury (Pen. Code, § 243, subd. (d)). Appellant appealed the dispositional order, which we affirmed. (*In re A.S.* (Sept. 20, 2018, B287306) [nonpub. opn.] )

Following a victim restitution hearing, the juvenile court determined that \$23,345 was owed to the victim, R.G., for injuries sustained because of the battery. Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant. After an examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief requesting that the court make an independent review under *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. (See *In re Kevin S.* (2003) 113 Cal.App.4th 97, 99 [*Wende* procedure applies in juvenile delinquency appeals].)

We subsequently advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues that he wished us to consider. The 30 days have since passed, and appellant has not presented any contentions or issues for our consideration.

On January 20, 2017, appellant hit R.G. in the mouth with his closed fist. One tooth was knocked out, requiring immediate oral surgery and a subsequent root canal. At the time of the hearing, R.G. was in the process of getting an implant and crown. A second tooth was damaged, with the strong possibility that it might not be saved. R.G.'s mother provided invoices for all of the dental work, plus estimates for future dental work.

Appellant's dental expert reviewed the documents and testified that the invoice for the oral surgery had a summary of previous expenses, but no itemization of the charges. He also testified that the amount seemed unreasonably high.

The juvenile court ordered victim restitution in the amount of \$23,345, based on the out-of-pocket expenses incurred. The total includes \$16,566 for the emergency oral surgery, \$169 for the emergency room visit, \$2,585 for the implant and abutment,

and \$4,025 for the root canal, stay plate and bridge. The court did not include the \$1,950 estimate for future treatment. It stated that future amounts could be added later, assuming more expenses are incurred.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's counsel has fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issue exists. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 443; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 126.)

The restitution order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

PERREN, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P. J.

TANGEMAN, J.

Fred J. Fujioka, Judge  
Superior Court County of Los Angeles

---

Helen Hoeffel, under appointment by the Court of Appeal,  
for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.